



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,347	03/12/2004	Michael Ian McGregor	RPS920040005US1	9907
45219	7590	05/15/2008		
KUNZLER & ASSOCIATES 8 EAST BROADWAY SUITE 600 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER	
			RUBIN, BLAKE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,347	Applicant(s) MCGREGOR ET AL.
	Examiner BLAKE RUBIN	Art Unit 2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,10-18,20,21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8, 10-18, 20, 21, and 23 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is a response to communications filed April 10, 2008.
2. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-18, 20, 21, and 23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, 11, 14-17, and 20 are currently amended. Claims 2, 7, 9, 19, and 22 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-18, 20, 21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ring et al. (Pat. No. 7,080,104, hereinafter Ring), in view of Multer et al (U.S. Patent No. 7,007,041, hereinafter Multer)**

5. With respect to claim 1, Ring discloses an apparatus for automatically populating an interactive messaging contact list (column 3, lines 36-59), the apparatus comprising:
a retrieval module configured to retrieve contact information corresponding to online users from a plurality of contact sources associated with a user including at least one electronic address book (column 19, lines 4-10);

a validation module configured to accept or reject contact information for each online user and validate the contact information on a messaging server to provide validated contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2);

an insertion module configured to add the validated contact information to an interactive messaging contact list (column 19, lines 4-10); and

wherein at least a portion of the retrieval module, validation module, and the insertion module comprise at least one of logic hardware elements and executable code, the executable code stored on one or more computer readable media (column 7, lines 34-41).

But, Ring does not disclose local contact sources, or interactive prompting of the user.

However, Multer discloses a plurality of contact sources residing on a user's computer (column 11, lines 21-27), and interactively prompt the user during a single online session (column 2, lines 47-50, *interaction by the user*)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ring with the teachings of Multer. The motivation to combine being, to increase the accuracy and efficiency of the apparatus by allowing the user to check the conflicting data on the local computer.

6. With respect to claim 3, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the known address book format is selected from the group consisting of a Lotus Notes format, an Eudora Mail format, and a Microsoft Outlook format (column 8, lines 1-6).

7. With respect to claim 4, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the retrieval module is further configured to extract contact information by parsing an email address retrieved from the plurality of contact sources (column 15, lines 37-53).

8. With respect to claim 5, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the retrieval module is further configured to extract contact information by parsing a first and last name retrieved from the plurality of contact sources (column 15, lines 37-53).

9. With respect to claim 6, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the validation module is further configured to prompt a user to resolve conflicts in contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2).

10. With respect to claim 8, Ring discloses the method for automatically populating an interactive messaging contact list (column 3, lines 36-59), the method comprising:

retrieving contact information corresponding to online users associated with a user from a plurality of contact sources including at least one electronic address book (column 19, lines 4-10);

accepting or rejecting the contact information of each online user (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2);

validating the contact information on a messaging server to provide validated contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2); and

adding the validated contact information to an interactive messaging contact list (column 19, lines 4-10).

But, Ring does not disclose local contact sources, or interactive prompting of the user.

However, Multer discloses a plurality of contact sources residing on a user's computer (column 11, lines 21-27), and interactively prompt the user during a single online session (column 2, lines 47-50, *interaction by the user*)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ring with the teachings of Multer. The motivation to combine being, to increase the accuracy and efficiency of the apparatus by allowing the user to check the conflicting data on the local computer.

11. With respect to claim 10, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the known address book format is selected from the group consisting of a Lotus Notes format, an Eudora Mail format, and a Microsoft Outlook format (column 8, lines 1-6).

12. With respect to claim 11, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the method of claim 14, further comprising parsing the contact information (column 15, lines 37-53).

13. With respect to claim 12, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the method of claim 11, wherein parsing the contact information comprises resolving a first and last name (column 15, lines 37-53).

14. With respect to claim 13, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the method of claim 8, further comprising prompting a user to resolve conflicts in the contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2).

15. With respect to claim 14, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the method of claim 13, further comprising enabling a user to selectively insert contacts into the interactive messaging contact list (column 8, lines 1-17).

16. With respect to claim 15, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the method of claim 12, further comprising generating a confirmation request for an inserted contact (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2).

17. With respect to claim 16, Ring discloses an apparatus for automatically populating an interactive messaging contact list (column 3, lines 36-59), the apparatus comprising:

means for retrieving contact information corresponding to online users associated with a user from a plurality of contact sources including at least one electronic address book (column 19, lines 4-10);

means accept or reject the contact information for each online user_(column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2);

means for validating the contact information on a messaging server to provide validated contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2);

means for adding the validated contact information to an interactive messaging contact list (column 19, lines 4-10);

wherein at least one of means for retrieving contact information, means for prompting the user to accept or reject the contact information, means for validating the contact information, and means for adding the validation contact information comprise at least one of logic hardware elements and executable code, the executable code stored on one or more computer readable media (column 7, lines 34-41).

But, Ring does not disclose local contact sources, or interactive prompting of the user.

However, Multer discloses a plurality of contact sources residing on a user's computer (column 11, lines 21-27), and means for prompting the user during a single online session (column 2, lines 47-50, *interaction by the user*)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ring with the teachings of Multer. The motivation to combine being, to increase the accuracy and efficiency of the apparatus by allowing the user to check the conflicting data on the local computer.

18. With respect to claim 17, Ring discloses the system for automatically populating an interactive messaging contact list (column 3, lines 36-59), the system comprising:

a client computer configured to retrieve contact information corresponding to online users associated with a user from a plurality of contact sources including at least one electronic address book (column 19, lines 4-10);

the client computer further configured to accept or reject the contact information for each online user (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2);

a messaging server configured to validate the contact information to provide validated contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2); and

the client computer further configured to add the validated contact information to an interactive messaging contact list (column 19, lines 4-10).

But, Ring does not disclose local contact sources, or interactive prompting of the user.

However, Multer discloses a plurality of contact sources residing on a user's computer (column 11, lines 21-27), and means for prompting the user during a single online session (column 2, lines 47-50, *interaction by the user*)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ring with the teachings of Multer. The motivation to combine being, to increase the accuracy and efficiency of the apparatus by allowing the user to check the conflicting data on the local computer.

19. With respect to claim 18, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the client computer is further configured to prompt a user to resolve conflicts in contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2).

20. With respect to claim 20, Ring discloses a computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable program code configured to carry out a method for automatically populating an interactive messaging contact list (column 3, lines 36-59), the method comprising:

retrieving contact information corresponding to online users associated with a user from a plurality of contact sources residing on a user's computer including at least one electronic address book (column 19, lines 4-10);

accepting or rejecting the contact information for each online user (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2);

validating the contact information on a messaging server to provide validated contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2); and

adding the validated contact information to an interactive messaging contact list (column 19, lines 4-10).

But, Ring does not disclose local contact sources, or interactive prompting of the user.

However, Multer discloses a plurality of contact sources residing on a user's computer (column 11, lines 21-27), and means for prompting the user during a single online session (column 2, lines 47-50, *interaction by the user*)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ring with the teachings of Multer. The motivation to combine being, to increase the accuracy and efficiency of the apparatus by allowing the user to check the conflicting data on the local computer.

21. With respect to claim 21, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 20, wherein the method further comprises prompting a user to resolve conflicts in contact information (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2).

22. With respect to claim 23, the combination of Ring and Multer discloses the computer readable storage medium of claim 20, wherein the method further comprises generating a confirmation request for an inserted contact (column 19, lines 61-67; column 20, lines 1-2).

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-18, 20, 21, and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. Burke U.S. Patent 7,254,573
- b. Auerbach et al U.S. Patent 6,549,937
- c. Grossman et al U.S. Pub. 2004/0119761
- d. Van Geldern et al U.S. Pub. 2004/0019634

Art Unit: 2157

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLAKE RUBIN whose telephone number is (571) 270-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BJR

/Ario Etienne/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157